DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 130 314 CS 203 027

AUTHOR Merchant, Frank
TITLE Existential Grammar for Composition.
PUB DATE 76
NOTE 19p.; Paper presented at the Kentucky Interdisciplinary Conference on Linguistics (Richmond, Kentucky, April 1976)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.83 HC-$1.67 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Composition (Literary); *Composition Skills (Literary); Deep Structure; *English Instruction; *Grammar; Higher Education; Linguistics; Secondary Education; Traditional Grammar

ABSTRACT

The teaching of grammar has been in sad decline since medieval times, when it included the whole skill of creating in language. Our textbook community has moved through a series of ineffective fashions, from those of Fries to post-Chomsky. All have presumed to replace prescriptive rules with realistic explanations. But all have fallen, like the worst of traditional grammar, into abstraction. Instead of adhering to pedagogical and theoretical faddism, the teacher of composition needs to formulate practical standards for the effective expression of our language. The use of the language is best studied in, and through, writing. A practical study of grammatical practice needs to be both historical and literary. In stylistics or rhetoric, the larger grammar needs to be existential: not a system in itself but an aid to making judgments about expressive, often traditionally ordered, variables.
(Author/JM)

****
* Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished *
* materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort *
* to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal *
* reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality *
* of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available *
* via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not *
* responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions *
* supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

ED130314

(for KICL - EKU
April 2, 1976)

Frank Merchant
(Union College - English)

Existential Grammar for Composition

Grammar is in sad decline since those mediaeval times when it could include the whole skill of creating in language, including rhetoric and prosody. We can only wonder now that the Scots came to designate one full of its learning as glamorous. In the interests of "English as she is spoke" and against supposedly unscientific, snobbish prescriptive rules, the textbook community has moved, through Friesian descriptivism to Chomskyan transformational to formulas, often as confusedly semi-mathematical as Emmon Bach's, which are supposed to describe the innate psychological patterns which generate expressions from kernel sentences by "rigorously" logical phase-rules. All this was supposed to replace grammar rules for writing "fixed" in the 18th and 19th centuries. The rules, as the various new grammars named editorial and elitist social conventions, were aurealistic--so we have been told by all the professors of the New Grammar in the most scholastic of language arrangements. Besides, continued teaching of grammar from grades to freshman college levels had no effect on speech or writing. Thus we were led to drop most years of grammar teaching and much corrected composition in all our schools--including the once-universal college freshman requirement. For those, we can discover an odd substitution of developmental reading and remedial writing. Concomitantly, since World War I, American Education has been evaluating largely by multiple-choice, arbitrarily machine-scored tests denominated objective. These punchboard exercises, replacing language for determining course credit all over our disciplines, cannot be identified with the New Grammar they preceded (they were in great use while Charles Carpenter Fries was starting the later movement, in the

CS 203 027

1920's). But they have made the old, prescriptivist syntax appear unnecessary for getting any diploma. Meanwhile, fashionable schoolbooks and graduate study in linguistics, with their explanations of the New Grammar's lex. con and its "generations," have served to reduce further the practice and the judgment of composition by the traditional standards of "unity, coherence and emphasis."

As an English teacher, I find myself surprised to have grown old in the belief that composition is the essence of my subject. All else, the rigorous and pragmatic logic of a half-century's experience in and outside classrooms has shown me, is auxiliary (however greatly so) to the end-result of English training and all the kinds of work in the world which English trains one to do. Grammar as study of the use and ordering of words, is the regulatory skill for composition; today it means mostly the production of sense and effect in sentences, but its advanced levels can be considered, as by the New Rhetoricians, to paragraphs, longer works in prose and verse and overall stylistics--all based, necessarily, on the statement form. Without the production (or criticism) of compositions, grammar is useless, however amusing or prestigious it may become to those interested in playing its game for the sake of itself. This leaves it unlike mathematics, whose pure theory does mean creation of a mental world, in addition to its applicable profits. The creations of grammar are the pictures, actions, arguments of compositions, according to their effectiveness. Its terms cannot remain abstract, operating by themselves; the treatment of specific words for production is their life and reference, without which grammar patterns are less than mere line or sound-abstractions. It should not be hard to argue,

from this, that there can be no abstract systems of grammar for practiced languages evidenced in individual statements, never mind "universals" of grammar for all languages.

Practical grammar, as I have called it, works and is trained best through writing, in which its use has been made important--as the history of the subject shows us. The Greek root (γραφ) demonstrates the written, lasting, more fixedly considerable origin and operation of the grammarous. Say three decades of New Grammar in a whirlpool of curriculum reform hit the fan last Spring and Fall when a decline in teenagers' writing bility on tests gave force to the outcries of basic education advocates. The proclaimed decline was featured in an edition of Business Week, as well as press association dispatches, and summed up in the "Why Johnny Can't Write" article in the Dec. 8, 1975 Newsweek, which seems to have been quoted in the dailies to a public far wider than that weekly's usual circulation.[1]

The New Grammarians' and Educationists' defensiveness against the news media's, general public's and uninitiated classroom teachers' protests could, I realize from watching 60 years' rounds of pedagogical faddism and unpalatable revivals, have been anticipated. Hardly had the first stories about the SAT scores come out, in June, 1975 than educator- administrators reacted with complaints about an expected outcry of "Back to basics!" Their rationale (oral and printed, as far as I observed them) was that accountability for language performance would turn back all the (I presume, psychic) progress made in phase-elective, open-classroom, non-subject-matter schools after the subsidence of the Sputnik (pro-science, communication skills and languages) scare. My sending Edward P. J. Corbett (New Rhetoric promulgator

at Ohio State) a copy of a speech to Upper Cumberland, Kentucky, teachers urging that they turn away from all diverting fads and theories to teach the use of language, centering on writing, drew from the editor of College Composition and Communication a scornful reproof: I was levelling a shot-gun blast at many methodologies, including transformational grammar, which have advanced our profession and, in some cases, provided strategies for a viable syntax. My speech and Corbett's anguished denial were written (neither has been published) last Fall, several years after the attenuation of college English departments (including the abolition of Freshman Composition at Ohio State), perhaps before the effects of the SAT scores had been realized and while Newsweek was preparing its December 8, 1975 article.

I couldn't resist reminding Professor Corbett of what has happened to Departments of English--to my mind, because of the rule of the non-literate objective test in the United States, the destruction of Composition training, and, in some part, to diversion of English classes from practical writing to a new and abstract and non-prescriptive language study.[2] As to strategies for a "viable syntax," my notions about concept of useful grammar were reinforced at the NCTE's 1972 convention in Minneapolis, where Ezor and Lane (then of Jersey City State tore up Transformational contentions with a report on the success of their "Applied Linguistics" strategies with grade school youngsters from culturally deprived, even bilingual (or, nearly monolingually Spanish) families.[3]

Teachers of my Appalachian area have not been enthusiastic or "supportive" of Transformational Grammar in the last decade. The Paul Roberts series for middle and high schools, which start with transforms and phase rules, has

been dropped rapidly, even where the textbook salesmen got the books introduced. In fact, here--as nationally--the sum of grammar teaching, however related to writing has been reduced, more often than not to one year in the six pre-college grades. The "phase elective" fad has displaced grammar, as well as basic and intelligible writing, as a required subject throughout our public schools. New Grammar adherents may well contend that schoolteachers have not understood or applied themselves to these "scientific, linguistic" theories, with the exception of a few enthusiasts for N. G. as a cause. And my observation of these disciples has been they have far more often been asserting beliefs than applying a discipline.

Meanwhile, in the graduate schools, transformational abstractions show signs of being in more trouble than prescriptive, Latinate or historical linguistics were, in the 1950's. Not only is there an intensifying ambience of concern about writing itself, tending to denial of any syntax theory which obviates standards of "correctness," but there is also increasingly open distrust of the meaningfulness or truth of generative structures. Too much has been what may be produced by inventing a 'generative line' of sounds to deduce morphemes in a language--as I discovered, when listening to a 1960's talk on Esthonian at the University of Kentucky: modern forms were glibly assumed, until a speaker of modern Esthonian broke in. Language generation, throughout, is a matter of history, not abstract reason, as I have long known, in telling students they can explain an English word's relationship to say, Latin, by Grimm's Law but can never assume by consonantal shift that there must be a certain English form resulting from an earlier Indo-European root.[4] Sentences may be reduced

to kernels or less meaningful, less ambiguous deep structures with results of problematic value, but transformational analysis starts with a sentence and goes through treeing and phase rules to arrive at the same sentence--as I used to go mistily through high school physics problems.

Chomskyan linguistics originally disdained connection with meaning in its formalism; and so we might assume the New Grammarians' later oozing into their own Semantics has betrayed some dissipation of the movement's 'hard,' 'scientific,' 'universal' abstraction. And Chomsky's universals were presumed to be built on inbuilt psychological mechanisms or brain-channels so that soon one could say that "every child knows his own language"--apparently by growing in a linguistic environment rather than by being taught. Yet this is now being denied by the school of Paul Postal; this could mean a fundamental denial, more than a heresy. And the cycle of Linguistics is veering round to the argument offered in a December, 1975, text by Jan Robinson (University College of Swansea) in his The New Grammarians' Funeral, A Critique of Noam Chomsky's Linguistics:[5]

> ...argues that Chomsky's distinguished work is in traditional grammar and that when he concurrently continues a modern ambition to turn linguistics into an exact science, Chomsky fails completely. Mr. Robinson uses this discussion to suggest criteria by which anything calling itself the study of language must be examined as being more closely related to philosophy and literary criticism than to science.

When it comes to searching out ramifications of meaning (rather than deep structures) or solving ambiguities (provided they should be solved), I will claim that I can find more sense in applying the history of words, of society, of ideas in history and all the range of literary style and recorded idiom than by reducing rich statements to positivistic kernels or even working out a purely literary formula of 'ambiguity-irony-dramatic

tension' according to the 1930's once-New Criticism. Phase rules seem to me long-winded, extraneously difficult ways of explaining the 'active-passive transform' or the amplification of a simple into a complex sentence. Although there appear to be principles of some methodology involved in those operations, I know that writers perform them by a feeling of acquaintance, mainly with literature, and a feeling for language rising from habit, not from recollecting some generalized mechanics, as one might do, disastrously, in trying to reinstruct oneself in how to walk.

We have come to the notion that our practice of grammar may result in an art, literature, being in its deed the art's first step. Grammar, with its writing, does represent some rationalization of sound and expression toward controlled communication, but it never makes language wholly positivistic. A true, "deep structure" study of language leads us to analysis of the symbology in the origin of words and how much of this etymology--even Freudian or Groddeckian--a writer may be employing. Language's effects from its written pages are always more than its surface-code meanings; the subconscious and consciously-realized philology and history of use in literature add even more--much more--to verbal expression than do oral intonations.[6] Combining words in structures from sentences to opics and novels creates mental, emotional and social situations richer or "more meaningful" than those surrounding recited words. Modern psychological-historical literary criticism, which reaches for the nature of the writer in the manner of the Swiss-French existential school together with an awareness of the psychological depths in social effects and surroundings, might well be applied to the "disease" of the fumbling accused at Watergate

trials or of foolishly confused advertising (like A & P's "Price and Pride") as well as to the "health" of Wordsworth or William Faulkner.[7]

Writers trained to be conscious of what the technique of grammar is doing in application to their work will realize it is like the techniques of other arts--say music--in selecting some rational tradition of ordering which may be varied and individualized, according to their reactions to the conventions of society and history. Grammar is not a single code in English, although it works under the shadow of the same Latinate, Indo-European tradition of the paradigms which have been applied to order from Sanskrit through Thrax and Bishop Lowth or the Fowlers to Edwin Newman and Bernstein in attempts to show how conventions may be directed for force and clarification--but they must be used more as cautions against undisciplined confusions than as some kind of unvarying algebraic procedure. Grammar is a set of conventions, prejudices, codes of manners; memories of past styles; and recent, lively experiments which shows how to keep the game of expression going, with some broadening and cheating--so that one's opposite players, or audience, will respect its shifting discipline. It is significant to note that "practical grammarians" most noted by the clerisy of these times have been newspapermen, suspicious of fusty scholarship while they ask of learning what authority of tradition in literature will back up some familiarly logical and customarily forceful usage.

One thinks of the Spanish word for "language"--idioma--as being a more meaningful "deep etymology" for that within which grammar, or its supposed rules, operates. The rule, however prescriptive, is usefully which rationalized practice and something from which to deviate: like the Spanish accentuation on the penult of words ending in n, s or vowels, which

so frequently fails to hold that it sprinkles accents on the ultima throughout that language; or the peculiar indecision of American English about the number of collective nouns (ruled singualr); or the anacolantha accepted as rhetoric in the most subtle Attic Greek style, like that of Thucydides. Rules can be only pretentious, like the 19th century differentiation between shall and will in the future, which never was observed by the "best" writers. And useful ones, for marking out specific meaning, can so fail of enforcement that the most arbitrary stylebook must give way: as with prohibiting me or other pronoun objectives after it's; differentiating who from whom, yet retaining whom after prepositions; and, sadly, admitting hopefully to all levels of journalism, never mind politics or business, as an absolute signifying "It is hoped that." Levels of usage for vocabulary in combination is a rationale which requires a corollary of adept violation for a lively style, much as rules about mixing up sentence and paragraph lengths and structures require neglect when writers decide they need rather to go by their feeling for the inner rhythm of what they are thinking. Grammar rules, then, depend on hints from what has been considered good writing, prejudices which accord with the persona a writer is trying to make effective, the ambience of styles listened to in his time, and the character of an individual writer's daring--all to be judged editorially by those who oversee writing communication, whether they be teachers, the writers' peers, office managers or customers, or a writer growing out of servile imitation toward becoming a master.

Grammatical rules and systems, accordingly, cannot be abstract, rigid, or systems except in the sense of delimiters of a felt standard acquired from considerable acquaintance with the English language. This applies more to

English, I think, than any other partly synthetic language; English's syntacticism and an exceptionally large and multi-based vocabulary permit a great deal of "shimmer" around almost every established element of stylistics.

To write a grammar, never mind a rhetoric, which has genuine, current reference to English is to write documented descriptions of its features in use--very likely following an outline of Indo-European paradigms and parts of Speech, as well as major classifications of syntactic sentence order (the familiar S,V,O) to keep the learner aware of how rule-breakers or anacolontha are to be noted in their variations from prescriptions or norms. Even "prescriptivist" grammar of the 18th century was often a rationalist justification for Latinate authority or much-used new idiom. Without a sense of tradition and rule, business English--and, we may deduce, its speech--was confusing in its outpourings of directions; so much so that one gathers from the examples in Mary Beard's history or in many examples of private correspondence before Defoe and neo-classicism that only those who knew what the writers were going to write about understood them.

Still, the rules of "standard" grammar need to be described, in all their variations, rather than laid down, if they are to be understood as both living and effective. For this reason, I have found Lamprecht's[8] Grammatik der Englischen Sprache, as used in both East and West German universities, to be the "truest" of foreign-written grammars of our language (including Scheurweghs and Zandvoort) because the Heidelberg syntaxist has made an anthology of examples, mostly from 20th century

British fiction, to answer specific questions of Germans about the idiomatic and accepted use of English on a fairly sophisticated level. The most useful grammars for students within English are narrower, even when they do set up a prescriptivist and standardizing basis which will aid students toward communicability and clarity. Even as freshman handbooks, like Sheridan Baker's The Complete Stylist,[9] they slant and limit their usefulness by urging certain idiosyncracies of style which may be accused of being too journalistic and temporal--like the precepts of Copeland, Strunk, Robert Penn Warren, or the New York Times.

I argue, from knowledge of how grammar works, that it is not logically systematic or to be put into accord with any logical or psychological model. It is a practice in which one has to take into account many variations of a character composed by historical, social, tonal and aesthetic standards. These practices are guided in as much variation, or confusion, of both set rules and, possibly, newly accepted phrasings as verse has been, beyond rigid mechanics--even before the breakthrough from meter announced from Ezra Pound to Charles Olsen, and now dominant in that art.[10] A writer takes on existential responsibility when he composes a sentence and makes himself and his thought responsible for it. He needs the definite, historical language to fashion even if he "makes it new" (as Eliot and Pound sought to do with tradition through the individual talent). He draws from the practice of the language as it is fixed, with some indeterminacy about which he must make decisions, in his own time; it would be more impossible for him to be diachronic, or "universal," although he may risk time's reversal for some special

grammatical originality (if he wants to establish an authority like that of the King James Bible).

This existential responsibility for viable, effective communication applies to ordinary business-of-the-world writing as well as to the most responsible speech. Control and basis for formulating statements (which are, or can be extended to, ideas) rest on the accepted conventions of the idioms, the traditions of Indo-European grammar we still honor and preserve in writing and use to speak outside our own minds and social corners. Variations—I would often call them reductions—of the accepted EAE (Edited American English)—can be recognized, as we range "down" social levels and/or "across" dialects from its stance. I am inclined to take lightly and querulously the concept of Black English in America outside the (misnamed) "ghetto" because I encounter so few Negroes who can handle it—probably because they haven't read Dillard or the apparently not-continuing texts distributed in it. In both fully integrated and still dominantly Black colleges, the problem "dialect" encountered is most often composed of pseudo-literary, outmoded syntactical formalism, aberrant coinages in the same vein (like illuminationed), examples of the "hip" or Harlemese in which the student outside the "ghetto" is not very secure and—mostly—the slipshod, non-specific word use, the illogical and muddled word-grouping, the misconceived spellings and folk etymologies, the failure to mark meaning by punctuation, the heedless and gobbled rush of sound which make an All-American Teenie, or Bop or Nixoff, as I have played with classifying its variations. Of all dialects, this is the most worthy of study by teachers; not that it will enable them to

communicate with their pupils any more than the y'know crowd does with one another, but in the future of education as acquaintance with the etiology of disease is useful to physicians.

The writing of New Grammars has been committed by persons aware of the aids to clear expression and to wide recognition of verbal intent which the Old Grammar has provided. I have not seen any literate students or text-writers who have used only generated structures and rules for phase. The conventions of the historical and "prescriptive" classifications--parts of speech, singular and plural, tense unity and sequence, statement marking by finite verbs and an editorially arbitrary punctuation--mark sense for reading or for more precisely required occasions of speech. The girl instructor at Providence (R.I.) College who, a few years ago in CCC argued that subjects and verbs may be mixed, both singular and plural, was advocating grammar as a jury rig as well as for less labor in English teaching. The conventions should help us with complexities of statement, acting as clarifiers of what we are and mean by their discipline and enabling us to control and select occasions when we want to say something special. Command of the language, the Council for Basic Education proposes in its latest Occasional Paper (No. 23) is to be secured by teaching twelve years of effective use from accepted style in the richness of all kinds of good writing, including literature, together with inculcation in that style through writing--making sure that all teachers (and, I presume textbook producers) are creating an effective environment of language:[11]

> ...we should not allow in any classroom teachers who lack a mastery of it. In their years of schooling, students progress far from imitation through which they first learned English, but they never completely leave imitation behind. All teachers teach language.

If, as Dr. Kenneth Oliver (Occidental College) declared in that pamphlet, "Grammar is what distinguishes a sentence from a list of words randomly ordered," grammar makes sense by providing words with control and slant or tone or direction in content. Orally, what has gone before and what surrounds a situation (even more than words) supply a sentence's missing verb or key to its intent. In writing, the field of the paragraphs and their essays does even more of the same bringing out of meaning; here to the relations of words and their units we must add more particular remarking of grammatical signs like the remnants of English inflection and the punctuation which imitates in code or even intensifies speech emphasis, or silence. This sense of content is to be learned from example--best seen in writing and, admittedly, richest and most adaptable in literature. Imaginative expression of experience and concepts in it does help to guard against scanted, quirky, false and temporarily fashionable use of words in studies, new or old, social or scientific or linguistic, which seek too arrogantly a logical positivism.

In expanding the base of accepted grammar, I therefore suggest moving from abstract or limited rules with examples, whether the latter be made up or limited for textbooks, to consideration of structure and style, showing pupils how English is written, both discursively and aesthetically, outside handbooks. This gives grammar teachers the job of renewing--or, if they use them, amending, judging controlling those anthologies. Admittedly, the traditional Reed-Kellogg sentence analysis made dead sentences, like those torn apart, rephased, dissected into kernels by the Transformationalists. I prefer seeing the sentence as an action or operation, examining it while

still, moving alive, not as a cut-up laboratory animal. At most, I would write independent clauses out in one long line for each, marking their two or three major parts (S; V; O or PN, PA), circling phrase and subordinate clause units and demonstrating their functions by arrows pointing at the major components. Paragraphs, as some of the New Grammarians have realized, are important as the way we organize most of our expression beyond stutter or command. It is more important to mark the forces in their field by arrows indicating what supports or fills out and double arrows pointing to conclusions and related transitions. In "real writing", single topic sentences may not even be wanted (as in rousing narrative and description). A good many esteemed essayists and article writers can be shown to have written double-ended or two-topic paragraphs in tension, in a manner transcending the simplistic, "lead sentence" or "summary-topic" paragraph which we expect our more skilled, mature learners of language to pass beyond. And, at some grade, writing teachers need to show their charges that "real writers" seldom plan their paragraphs around topics, but use the typographical arrangement as a "breath in thought," whose connectedness may be best expressed as inferential and supra-logical.

This is further description of the language which makes our culture as non-rigid and not to be studied in abstract terms or diagrams which do not accord with it. It denies grammar's value as a system in itself, but rather as an aid to making a judgment about expressive, often traditionally ordered variables. It asserts that the grammar teacher can offer us neither interest nor use without being more a writer, in practice and example, for the ends of composition.

-#-

Existential Grammar for Composition

-1-"Why Johnny Can't Write," Newsweek (Dec. 8, 1975), 58-65, credited to "Merrill Sheils with bureau reports." This piece started with the March, 1975 HEW Dept. report of a decline in reading skills since 1965 and the College Entrance Exam Board's forming in November, 1975 a panel to study the 12-year long decline in SAT scores, particularly in verbal skills.

My clipping file reveals this anthology of stories on the recognition of national educational failure and this protest against it: "Mother upset/son graduated, but can't read" (AP-San Francisco; Louisville Courier Journal 12-8-74); "Teachers say: 'Amen! Amen! Amen!'"Leading three letters from readers in favor of "formal English" (CJ 6-21-75); "Semi-literate freshmen," letter agreeing with those letters (CJ 7-3-75); "How about a Reading Corps," Joseph H. Blatchford of Los Angeles Times Service on revelation of 26-million American illiterates, an article in the background of the preceding comments (CJ 8-6-73); "College Board test-scores drop" (AP-New York; CJ 9-7-73); "Educator wants/ years in college,/ high school cut," AP-Washington, in which a former U.S. education commissioner blamed TV (CJ 10-9-75); "High School/Reading Test/Scores Up," indicating functional literacy depends on socio-economic background, (AP-Washington; Knoxville News-Sentinel 9-9-75); "Panel to probe decline/ in College Board scores" (AP-New York; CJ 10-29-75); "Teen-agers' writing ability/has declined, test indicates," John Matthews of Washington Star service (CJ 11-18-75); "College Boards/to add test for writing," Gene I. Maeroff of N.Y. Times News Service in a story which has been bobbing up for years--like the much older one about the controversy of "ain't" (CJ 2-1-76).

-2-Consideration of whether Corbett is defending CCC's much-criticized "no standard English" program belongs to another paper which would include my observation of CCC members' adverse reaction to it at the St. Louis convention of March, 1975. Corbett was editor of the Fall, 1974 Special Issue of CCC, Students' Right to Their Own Language, but the issue was attributed to a special committee, to back up a resolution in repudiation since the Fall of 1971.

-3-See p. 53, on "C. U, Relating Transformational Grammar to the Teaching of Writing" in Minneapolis 72, program of the 62nd Annual Meeting of NCTE, Nov. 23-25, Ezor and Lane's repudiation of transformational techniques was joined by John C. Mellon (then of Boston University), the announced opponent of Enola Borgh (U. of Wisconsin-Milwaukee) at the Nov. 25 "Dialogue." My typescript samozdat "shotgun" attack was copied and distributed, mostly in Southeastern Kentucky in October, 1975.

-4-Latin hortus may have led, according to the Grimm formulas, to English garden; but Horatius did not give us anything like Gordie or George, which were descended without "transforms" from a Greek root [illegible] - indicating farmer.

-5-"Library Advance Information Sheet" from the Cambridge University Press" dated "December 1975" and apparently sent from CUB's New York office, since the price given for Robinson's book is "$13.95."

-6-See Martin Grotjohn, The Voice of the Symbol (NY: Dell-Delta, 1973, reprinted from the 1971 Mara Book). Groddeck's belief in the free creative force of language in children and literary classics is cited on p. 128. Use of grammatical "rational thinking" while "The symbol preserves (or prepares) mastery over thought, ideas, emotion" and the use of words for "possessive mastery" rather than more reference are described, pp. 161-164 ff.

-7-I find modern literary criticism's search for the broad and deep meanings and more, discoveries, in language art's creation exemplified in Geoffrey N. Hartman (Yale), Beyond Formalism, Literary Essays 1958-1970 (New Haven and London: Yale U.P., 1970). Note particularly his noting the effect of the "trespass" of the mythical word, even though the classics may seem to have lost "their power to be models for communal behavior," pp. 8-9, 23-4. See also Hartman's statement of the role of consciousness, uttered language, as middle term more than both the mysterious subconscious and itself, pp. 301-303.

-8-Adolf Lamprecht, Grammatik der englischen Sprache (Berlin: Volk u. Wissen Volkseigener Verlag, 1970). This is an enlargement of the original, 1956 edition, continuing to seek the Systemcharakter of English by further citation of 23 British writers and Ernest Hemingway, as well as 35 considerations of English and its teaching, from the United States, England and Europe. Significantly, notice how Lamprecht's description comes closer to dealing with what the preposition is, from its use and a brave categorization of the idioms of the nine most important prepositions (pp. 309-330)--a topic whose difficulties are parsed over with general definitions in other writers, as by Barbara Strung in England recently (Modern English Structure, Second Edition, New York: St. Martin's Press, 1968--2nd edition of 1968 work): pp. 192-194, describing the nature of prepositions and differentiating them from adverbs. The use of specific prepositions in their circumstances is not taught in English-speaking schools and has little handbook aid I know of since the Odyssey Press textbook went out of print, a generation ago.

-9-Sheridan Baker, The Complete Stylist and Handbook (NY: Thomas Y. Crowell Co., 1976) is the current combination and revision of 1966 and 1972 books. Baker, in his Preface, announces he has put together a rhetoric to get students to write as he wants them to, with reinforcing materials on contemporary usage: Note that he avoids the idioms of prepositions (see my footnote 8) in five lines on p. 367 and that his lively definitions and prescriptions follow Copeland and Strunk's tradition of a limiting idiosyncrasy, as in "The Healthy English Sentence," on reference and consistency (pp. 400-401).

-10-Much which can be applied to variation in grammar from a consideration of poetic technique (poetry was the first literature) has been gathered

in The Poetics of the New American Poetry, edited by Donald Allen & Warren Tallman (NY: Grove Press, Evergreen Original E-609, 1973). See how the specualtions of Ernest Fenellosa do point to the trans-logic of language (pp. 29-;32), never mind how right he may be about the Chinese ideogram. See Pound's "Credo" (pp. 37-43) for a relation of prosody to conventions of grammar; and Olson on field for the form of poetry (and linguistic expression), (pp. 147-153), making the relations in an expression--by tone or feeling--a determining principle.

-11-Kenneth Oliver, A Sound Curriculum In English Grammar: Guidelines for Teachers and Parents (Washington, D.C.: Council for Basic Education--Occasional Papers Number Twenty-Three), p. 42 in conclusion. The next CBE quotation is for page 9 and an inside-the-cover summary.